	Case 5:06-cv-05330-RS Document 181	Filed	04/30/10	Page 1 of 4		
1 2 3 4				*E-Filed 4/30/10*		
5						
7 8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
9	SAN JOSE DIVISION					
10			Master File No. C-06-05330-RS			
11 12	In re PMC-SIERRA, INC. DERIVATIVE LITIGATION	)	[PROPOSED] FINAL JU ORDER OF DISMISSA DATE: April 29, 2010 TIME: 1:30 p.m.	FINAL JUDGMENT AND ISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE		
13	This Document Relates To:	)				
14	ALL ACTIONS.	TIN		p.m.		
15		, 60	UKIKOOI	M: The Honorable Richard Seeborg		
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28			<b>V</b>			
	518985_1					

This matter came before the Court for hearing pursuant to the Order of this Court, dated January 26, 2010 ("Order"), on the application of the parties for approval of the settlement ("Settlement") set forth in the Stipulation of Settlement dated November 5, 2009 (the "Stipulation"). Due and adequate notice having been given to the current PMC-Sierra, Inc. ("PMC") shareholders as required in said Order, and the Court having considered all papers filed and proceedings had herein and otherwise being fully informed in the premises and good cause appearing therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that:

- 1. This Judgment incorporates by reference the definitions in the Stipulation, and all capitalized terms contained herein shall have the same meanings as set forth in the Stipulation (in addition to those capitalized terms defined herein).
- 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Federal Action, including all matters necessary to effectuate the Settlement, and over all parties to the Federal Action, including the Plaintiffs, the current PMC shareholders and the Defendants.
- 3. The Federal Action and all claims contained therein, as well as all of the Released Claims, are dismissed with prejudice. As between Plaintiffs and Defendants, the parties are to bear their own costs, except as otherwise provided in the Stipulation regarding Plaintiffs' Counsel's attorneys' fees and expenses.
- 4. The Court finds that the Stipulation and Settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate as to each of the Settling Parties, and hereby finally approves the Stipulation and Settlement in all respects, and orders the Settling Parties to perform its terms to the extent the Settling Parties have not already done so.
- 5. Upon the Effective Date, the Plaintiffs (acting on their own behalf and derivatively on behalf of PMC) and PMC shall have, and each current PMC shareholder shall be deemed to have and by operation of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished and discharged (i) the Released Claims against the Released Persons; and (ii) any and all claims (including Unknown Claims) arising out of, relating to, or in connection with, the defense, settlement, or resolution of the Actions, against the Released Persons. Nothing herein shall in any way impair or restrict the rights of any Settling Party to enforce the terms of the Stipulation.

- 6. Upon the Effective Date, each of the Released Persons shall be deemed to have, and by operation of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished, and discharged each and all of the Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Counsel from all claims (including Unknown Claims) arising out of, relating to, or in connection with the institution, prosecution, assertion, settlement, or resolution of the Actions or the Released Claims. Nothing herein shall in any way impair or restrict the rights of any Settling Party to enforce the terms of the Stipulation.
- 7. The Court finds that the notice given to current PMC shareholders was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. Said notice also provided the best notice practicable under the circumstances of these proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed Settlement set forth in the Stipulation, to all Persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.1 and the requirements of due process.
- 8. The Court hereby approves the fee award in accordance with the Stipulation and finds that such fee is fair and reasonable.
- 9. Neither the Stipulation nor the Settlement, nor any act performed or document executed pursuant to or in furtherance of the Stipulation or the Settlement: (a) is or may be deemed to be or may be offered, attempted to be offered, or used in any way by the Settling Parties as a presumption, a concession or an admission of, or evidence of, any fault, wrongdoing or liability of the Defendants or of the validity of any Released Claims; or (b) is intended by the Settling Parties to be offered or received as evidence or used by any other person in any other action or proceeding, whether civil, criminal, or administrative. Released Persons may file the Stipulation and/or this Judgment in any action that may be brought against them in order to support a defense or counterclaim based on principles of *res judicata*, collateral estoppel, full faith and credit, release, good faith settlement, judgment bar or reduction, or any other theory of claim preclusion or issue preclusion or similar defense or counterclaim.
- 10. During the course of the litigation, the parties and their respective counsel at all times complied with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 and all other similar laws.

518985\_1

1	11. Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, this Court hereby retains
2	continuing jurisdiction over the Federal Action and the parties to the Stipulation to enter any further
3	orders as may be necessary to effectuate the Stipulation, the Settlement provided for therein, and the
4	provisions of this Judgment.
5	12. This Judgment is a final, appealable judgment and should be entered forthwith by the
6	Clerk in accordance with Rule 58, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.
8	DATED: 4/29/10
9	THE HONORABLE RICHARD SEEBORG UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10 111 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Submitted by,  ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP SHAWN A. WILLIAMS 100 Pine Street, Suite 2600 San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: 415/288-4545 415/288-4534 (fax)  ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP TRAVIS E. DOWNS III JEFFREY D. LIGHT BENNY C. GOODMAN III  s/ Jeffrey D. Light JEFFREY D. LIGHT 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619/231-1058
23	619/231-7423 (fax) Lead Counsel for Plaintiff
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>	THE WEISER LAW FIRM, P.C. ROBERT B. WEISER 121 N. Wayne Avenue, Suite 100 Wayne, PA 19087 Telephone: 610/225-2677 610/225-2678 (fax)
28	Additional Counsel for Plaintiff
1	[ <del>PROPOSED]</del> FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE - C-06-05330-RS - 3 -